



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/612,196 | 07/02/2003 | Keith FitzPatrick | 930036-2008 | 4118 |
| 20/999 7590 11/05/2008 FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| PIZIALI, ANDREW T | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 1794 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 11/05/2008 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <p align="center">Interview Summary</p> | Application No. 10/612,196 | | Applicant(s) FITZPATRICK, KEITH | |
| | Examiner Andrew T. Piziali | | Art Unit 1794 | |
| | | | | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Andrew T. Piziali. (3) _____.

(2) Brian McGuire. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 04 November 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: FitzPatrick (USPN 5,753,085).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the non-final rejection mailed 8/4/2008. Discussed proposed amendments to the claims to overcome the 35 USC 112 rejections. Discussed the currently claimed "coated/impregnated" limitation. Applicant's representative indicated that USPN 5,753,085 does not include any form of the word "impregnate" and therefore the applied prior art fails to teach the claimed impregnating limitation. The examiner indicated that further review would be required.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

(Andrew T. Piziali/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794